

# EXHIBIT 20

1 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

3 BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL I. BEGERT, JUDGE PRESIDING

4 DEPARTMENT NUMBER 8

5 ---oo---

6 PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, )  
7 Plaintiff, ) Court No. 23016773  
8 vs. ) 23012573  
9 JACKSON VANDEUSEN, ) 24003016  
10 Defendant. ) 24003014  
11 ) Pages 1 - 9  
-----

12 **REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

13 MONDAY, MAY 20, 2024

14

15

16

17

18 TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED PURSUANT TO Government Code 69954(d):  
19 Any court, party, or person who has purchased a transcript may,  
20 without paying a further fee to the reporter, reproduce a copy or  
21 portion thereof as an exhibit pursuant to court order or rule, or  
22 for internal use, but shall not otherwise provide or sell a copy  
23 or copies to any other party or person.

24

25

26

27 REPORTED BY: TRINA AYALA, CSR NO. 12964

28

1       APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

2       For the People:

3       SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE  
4       Brooke Jenkins, District Attorney  
5       350 Rhode Island Street  
6       North Building, Suite 400N  
7       San Francisco, California 94103  
8       BY: **MICHELLE DAWSON**, ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY

9       For the Defendant:

10      SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE  
11      Manohar Raju, Public Defender  
12      555 Seventh Street  
13      San Francisco, California 94103  
14      BY: **SUJUNG KIM**, DEPUTY PUBLIC DEFENDER

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 MONDAY, MAY 20, 2024

2 P R O C E E D I N G S

3 ---oo---

4 9:21 A.M.

5 THE COURT: This is the Drug Court regular calendar, lines  
6 20 through 23, Jackson Vandeusen. Counsel, please state your  
7 appearances.

8 MS. DAWSON: Michelle Dawson for the People.

9 MS. KIM: Suejung Kim on behalf of Mr. Vandeusen. He is not  
10 present in Court and I will waive his appearance for this  
11 proceeding.

12 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Vandeusen's appearance is waived. I  
13 had previously ruled that electronic monitoring was not necessary  
14 as a condition of Mr. Vandeusen's release. Excuse me, I had  
15 previously ruled that electronic monitoring should be ordered for  
16 Mr. Vandeusen, but I did not find that waiving his Fourth  
17 Amendment right was necessary as a condition of his release on  
18 electronic monitoring.

19 The program that conducts the electronic monitoring does not  
20 want to monitor Mr. Vandeusen unless there is what is called a  
21 1035 search condition. So, Ms. Kim, you may address that.

22 MS. KIM: Thank you. So just to be clear, the e-mail that  
23 was received from the Sheriff's Department Community Program from  
24 Sergeant Tiffany Martin stated that, quote, we will need the  
25 minute order corrected along with a warrantless search condition  
26 by at least the SF Sheriff's Office covering the person, vehicle,  
27 property and home of the Defendant for him to participate in the  
28 SFSO Pretrial EM Program.

1       Now, just as a premise to all of this, I want to put on the  
2 record that only the Court can set conditions of pretrial release  
3 after weighing the circumstances of each individual case and that  
4 is a holding from the California Supreme Court in a case called  
5 *In re York*, 9 Cal.4th 1133. That's a 1995 case.

6       And so -- and there are other case law in the Federal  
7 context that says that weighing privacy rights against law  
8 enforcement objectives cannot be entrusted to the Executive who  
9 is an interested party, but instead calls for a neutral detached  
10 decision maker. So the bottom line is, only the Court can set  
11 conditions of release and the Court has done that.

12      Now we have the Sheriff who is a member of the Executive  
13 unilaterally deciding on its own that a search condition is  
14 necessary. And so that is the Federal Court and the case of  
15 *Simon versus City and County of San Francisco*, which is a pending  
16 case right now in the Ninth Circuit. There has been a  
17 preliminary injunction issued by the District Court that this  
18 very scenario is illegal and unconstitutional.

19      The fact is that the Sheriff cannot overrule the Superior  
20 Court's order when it comes to setting pretrial release  
21 conditions. And as far as this particular case goes,  
22 Mr. Vandeusen has been accepted into Mental Health Diversion. He  
23 has been -- he is going to be in a residential treatment program,  
24 Billie Holiday/TRP, correct, is that the Court's order?

25      THE COURT: It is what it is.

26      MS. KIM: Yes. Right. And so the Sheriff is saying in the  
27 e-mail that they need a 1035 search condition to supervise this  
28 person. This is a policy of the Sheriff's that they require the

1 1035 in every single EM release, regardless of the individual  
2 situation and circumstances of the case.

3 Here we have Mr. Vandeusen going to a residential treatment  
4 program. There is no reason, no logical reason for the Sheriff  
5 to need this authorization to search his person, vehicle, home  
6 and property while he is in a residential treatment program.

7 And so at this point, if the Sheriff is going to maintain  
8 their position, basically defying this Court's release order, I  
9 am going to ask the Court to order -- for an order to show cause  
10 hearing why the Sheriff should not be held in contempt.

11 The Sheriff is clearly in violation of this Court's release  
12 order. Mr. Vandeusen remains in custody. He was ordered  
13 released on May 16th, that was last Thursday. Today is May 20th.  
14 He is still in custody despite the Court ordering him to be  
15 released. So I am asking the Court for an OSC on the contempt  
16 finding.

17 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Dawson?

18 MS. DAWSON: Thank you, Your Honor. So to begin with, the  
19 Court granted Mental Health Diversion over the People's  
20 objection. The Court found that the Defendant could be released  
21 pursuant to electronic monitoring. Every case that comes through  
22 this Court that has electronic monitoring as a condition of  
23 someone's release is subject to the 1035 search condition.  
24 That's just across the board.

25 So the People, again, are requesting that this case be  
26 treated no differently than that if the Court is going to order  
27 electronic monitoring given that these are all burglary cases, I  
28 think that it is a good idea to have this electronic monitoring

1 at some point in the beginning of the treatment process.

2 There was a correspondence between Ms. Ronnie Singh of the  
3 Sheriff's Department and Ms. Kim. I think the Court was a party  
4 to all of that. But, essentially, her position we agree with it,  
5 is that the Sheriff's Department cannot safely administer  
6 electronic monitoring without a search condition.

7 And the alternative would be if the Court is going to issue  
8 a release order without electronic monitoring OR, or ACM, that  
9 doesn't have the electronic monitoring, but the Court did order  
10 or found that electronic monitoring was necessary in this case  
11 when it granted Mental Health Diversion last week in this case.

12 So, again, we are requesting the 1035 search condition if  
13 the Court is going to continue with the original order of  
14 electronic monitoring. Submitted.

15 MS. KIM: Your Honor, may I respond?

16 THE COURT: Yes. Briefly.

17 MS. KIM: So on May 16th when this issue was in front of the  
18 Court, the Court made an order that no search condition was  
19 necessary. So nothing has changed since then. And we would be  
20 agreeable to the Court changing the conditions and having  
21 Mr. Vandeusen released on his own recognizance or on ACM.

22 We would be fine with that. But if the Court is going to  
23 maintain its EM release, we are asking the Court to maintain the  
24 previous order that a search condition is not necessary and bring  
25 the Sheriff in here to -- to be held accountable as to why it is  
26 violating this Court's order.

27 THE COURT: Okay. So Mr. Vandeusen was not released on his  
28 own recognizance. He was released on a Drug Court Release Order,

1 which allows the Drug Court treatment staff to pick him up from  
2 custody and deliver him directly to a residential treatment  
3 program. That order will remain in affect.

4 I had previously found that Mr. Vandeusen's rights under the  
5 Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution did not need  
6 to be limited in order for him to participate in that program and  
7 that is still my finding.

8 I do not think it is unreasonable for the Sheriff's  
9 Department to say they do not want to conduct the electronic  
10 monitoring without the search condition. So I am not going to  
11 issue an order to show cause why they should or should not be  
12 held in contempt. I am just informed that they do not want to  
13 operate this program with respect to Mr. Vandeusen without the  
14 search condition.

15 So I am going to relieve Mr. Vandeusen of his electronic  
16 monitoring condition so that he can be picked up by the Drug  
17 Court treatment team on the existing release order, which will  
18 remain in affect. I am confirming the future date in Department  
19 8 of May 28, 2024, which is Drug Court at 9:00 a.m. And  
20 Mr. Vandeusen was previously informed of that date.

21 So the electronic monitoring condition for Mr. Vandeusen's  
22 release is now removed and all other orders will remain in  
23 affect. Ms. Dawson, you may make a record on that.

24 MS. DAWSON: Your Honor, the release without electronic  
25 monitoring is over the People's objection. Again, the Court  
26 granted Mental Health Diversion over our objection. These are a  
27 series of burglary cases. For that reason, we felt that it would  
28 be appropriate if Mental Health Diversion were granted there

1 should be some period of electronic monitoring. So this is over  
2 the People's objection that there is not going to be electronic  
3 monitoring. Submitted.

4 THE COURT: Thank you. We are off the record.

5 (Discussion off the record at 9:43 a.m.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
2 :ss  
3 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

4 I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand  
5 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby  
6 certify: That the foregoing proceedings were taken  
7 before me at the time and place herein set forth,  
8 that any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings,  
9 prior to testifying were placed under oath; that a  
10 verbatim record of the proceedings was made by me  
11 using machine shorthand, which was thereafter  
12 transcribed under my direction, further, that the  
13 foregoing is an accurate transcription thereof.

14 I further certify that I am neither financially  
15 interested in the action, nor a relative  
16 or employee of any attorney or any of the parties.

17 IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have this date  
18 subscribed my name.

19  
20 Dated: May 22, 2024

21 ***Trina Ayala, CSR 12964***

22 Trina Ayala  
23 CSR No. 12964

24  
25  
26  
27  
28